DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 170 CS 507 745

AUTHOR Gobetz, Robert H.; Scott, David K.
TITLE A Wolf in Sheep's Clothing: Message Legitimacy for Establishment Movements.
PUB DATE 4 Apr 92
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Sooner Communication Conference (Norman, OK, April 4, 1992).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Communication Research; *Rhetorical Criticism; *Rhetorical Invention; *Rhetorical Theory
IDENTIFIERS American Motorcyclist Association; Counter Culture; *Message Legitmacy; National Highway Traffic Safety Administration; *Rhetorical Strategies; Social Movements; Zarefsky (David)

ABSTRACT

In recent years, movement theorists have examined how rhetorical movements acquire legitimacy from established orders. The focus of past research has been the rhetorical dilemma of noninstitutional movements seeking recognition. David Zarefsky conceptualized establishment social movements as being rhetorically indistinguishable from noninstitutional movements. Zarefsky's conceptualization can be used to argue that establishment movements must also establish rhetorical legitimacy. Furthermore, a detailed case study is offered of the efforts of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to establish mandatory motorcycle safety legislation by interacting with the American Motorcyclist Association. This demonstrates that any establishment movement that targets counterculture groups faces the rhetorical dilemma of establishing institutional rhetorical legitimacy, and must develop a rhetorical strategy, such as the use of an out-group vehicle. The paper notes that the discussion of how legitimacy gaining strategies are employed by establishment movements targeting out-groups opens a new area of research for rhetorical scholars. One appendix, "The Pro-Rider Code of Ethics," is attached. (PRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED343170

A Wolf in Sheep's Clothing:

Message Legitimacy for Establishment Movements

Robert H. Gobetz
University of Oklahoma
Norman, OK

David K. Scott
Northeastern State University
Tahlequah, OK

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Scott

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS507745

Paper presented at the Sooner Communication Conference,
Norman OK, April 4, 1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

In recent years, movement theorists have examined how rhetorical movements acquire legitimacy from established orders. The focus of past research has focused on the rhetorical dilemma of noninstitutional movements seeking recognition. Zarefsky conceptualized establishment movements as being rhetorically indistinguishable from noninstitutional movements. This essay, based on Zarefsky's conceptualization, argues that establishment movements must also establish rhetorical legitimacy, and discusses the rhetorical dilemma of establishing institutional rhetorical legitimacy. We examine a case study of a rhetorical legitimation strategy used by an institutional group as an example.

A Wolf in Sheep's Clothing:

Message Legitimacy for Establishment Movements

Introduction

Much of the recent movement literature has attempted to provide a theoretical definition of what constitutes a social movement. Two major areas of controversy concern whether a movement must exist outside of institutional boundaries (or what we will refer to as noninstitutional in nature), and whether a movement falls within a conflict model of social change. Traditional rhetorical scholars have argued that movements must espouse fundamental social change through collective action, oppose the established order, and must be noninstitutional.

However, some scholars have dissented from this perspective. Zarefsky provided an example of a social movement that was institutionally-based but, contrary to the assumptions held in previous literature, exemplified the important rhetorical characteristics of an insurgent (or noninstitutional) movement.[1] Smith and Windes described innovational movements that did not follow the prescribed conflict theory pattern of dialectical tension between the establishment and the movement.[2]

Stewart, Smith, and Denton described social movements as being a unique collective phenomenon.[3] At the same time, they

---

[1]David Zarefsky, "President Johnson's War on Poverty: The Rhetoric of Three 'Establishment' Movements," Communication Monographs, 44, November 1977, 352-373.

[2]Ralph R. Smith and Russel R. Windes, "The Innovational Movement: A Rhetorical Theory," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 61, April 1975, 140-152.

[3]Charles J. Stewart, Craig Allen Smith, and Robert E. Denton, Jr., Persuasion and Social Movements, Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland, 1989.

acknowledge similar, yet distinctive, rhetorical movements as well; that is, they use the term "social" to identify a particular type of movement. Further, Stewart et al. suggested that it is the task of the rhetorical scholar is to determine where differences exist among movement categories. Other distinct types of movements include "institutional," "political," and "historical," all describing different phenomena. There is general agreement among rhetorical scholars concerning the existence of differences between movements.

The literature on planned social change is a related yet distinctly different area of scholarly inquiry than social movement theory. Generally speaking, the differences between the social change and social movement theory lie in two key areas. First, planned social change is a collaborative act between change agents and change targets where knowledge is applied to engineer movement in the social system toward an identified goal,[4] where social movement theory describes social phenomena without collaborative goals. In attempts of planned social change, change agents engineer desired social action guided by theory in pursuit of goals planned in conjunction with the change targets, and it is this collaborative process that sets distinguishes social change from social movements. Secondly, attempts of planned social change originate within institutional parameters. Social movements, by contrast, do not; typically

[4]Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin, The Planning of Change (4th Ed.), New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1985, p. 4.

they are the result of insurgent out-groups attempting to affect change within the institution.

We intentionally delineate these key differences between social change and social movement theory, because it is here where our thesis hinges. This essay contends that one rhetorically significant difference between institutionalized and noninstitutionalized movements has to do with each type of movement's legitimacy-gaining process. "Inherent legitimacy" is a characteristic usually associated only with institutionalized groups, but we point to a case where inherent legitimacy is found in a noninstitutionalized group. Further, we argue there are different rhetorical situations facing both types of movement as each strives to gain legitimation.

Message Legitimation

The issue of message legitimation as addressed in the social change literature has approached the process from various units of analysis. Zaltman and Duncan[5] explore the characteristics of change targets using the individual as the unit of analysis, and incorporate the concept of "legitimation" into their model of innovation adoption. If the change agent fails to demonstrate the social acceptability of an advocated change, the target group will likely be more resistant to the proposed change:

> The appropriateness of the action is of prime importance. This may be determined by the *individual by observing the performance of the behavior by others in his group, or by seeking affirmation from his peers*, or relatives, etc.

[5]Gerald Zaltman and Robert Duncan, Strategies for Planned Change, New York: Wiley & Sons, 1977.

> Social interaction is an important criterion for recognizing occurrence of the legitimation stage [italics added].[6]

Peer pressure is an important link in the legitimation process; without peer approval, social change is more difficult. The use of peer pressure as a strategy by change agents in change adoption is a key component in our case study, and will be discussed below.

Movement Legitimation

Sociologists have defined social movement legitimation as the process by which noninstitutionalized movements become legitimate in the eyes of the established order, the public, and potential members.[7] Consistent with this perspective, rhetorical scholars have argued that noninstitutionalized movements have the burden of establishing rhetorical legitimacy.

Stewart, Smith, and Denton offer a systematic analysis of how noninstitutional movements acquire rhetorical legitimacy, and identify two broad strategies used by such groups; co-active and confrontational. The co-active approach emphasizes movement rhetoric that identifies with moral symbols, sacred emblems, heroes, founding fathers, and revered documents of society.[8] Confrontational rhetoric tries to illustrate the illegitimacy of the established order. Typical actions include lawful protest and dissent; sit-ins, for example. An underlying goal of this

---

[6] Zaltman and Duncan, p. 232.

[7] Gaston Rimlinger, "The Legitimization of Protest: A Comparative Study in Labor History," in Joseph R. Gusfield (Ed.) Protest, Reform, and Revolt: A Reader in Social Movements, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971, p. 363.

[8] Stewart, Smith, and Denton, op. cit., "The Rhetoric of Legitimazation," pp. 71-79.

strategy is to provoke the establishment to overreact, perhaps through the use of violence to repress the movement. In such a case the movement could justifiably adopt a defensive posture, which would seem to the generalized public to be a moderate reaction. The outcome might take the form of sympathetic public opinion toward the movement.

A number of scholars have addressed the issue of institutional legitimacy. Zarefsky argues that institutional movements enjoy inherent legitimacy because such movements are chartered and sanctioned by part of the established order.[9] However, Francesconi points to situations where institutions do not always enjoy presumptive legitimacy.[10] Specifically, targets of rhetorical movements do not always confer presumptive legitimacy to establishment sources. Historically many social groups view the establishment as a "devil institution," the counter-culture movement and the Black Power movement being good examples. In this paper we add another example, that of motorcyclists and the views they hold of the federal government. To sum, any establishment movement that targets such counter-culture groups faces a rhetorical dilemma of establishing legitimacy.

Institutional Illegitimacy: NHTSA

A particularly useful example of the problems of institutional illegitimacy can be found in the efforts of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) to

[9] Zarefsky, Ibid.

[10] Robert A. Francesconi, "James Hunt, The Wilmington 10, and Institutional Legitimacy," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Feb. 1982.

establish mandatory motorcycle safely legislation. The NHTSA is an agency in the Department of Transportation, with a mission to ensure the safety of U.S. citizens who travel on the nation's highways. American motorcyclists, traditionally an independent minded collective, have resisted virtually every government attempt to regulate their behavior. Further, motorcyclists as a group tend to scorn any message from the establishment (in this case the federal government, specifically the NHTSA) perceiving such messages as tainted. The NHTSA, however, in a co-optive effort, has found a voice for its regulatory message through the use of the out-group organization the American Motorcyclist Association (AMA).

The AMA could be considered an out-group because of two factors. The first factor has to do with the counter cultural image of motorcyclists held by non-motorcyclists; the second is related to the political agenda of the AMA. Both of these factors will be considered in an examination of the origins and development of the AMA.

The AMA as Counter-Culture

We point to two clear indicators that motorcyclists are strongly identified as a counter-culture group. The first indicator suggests that motorcyclists, as the subject of popular film in America, exemplify anti-establishment themes. Monaco categorized motorcycle films into a genre appropriately entitled "Antisocial."[11] The controversial film "The Wild Angels" was one

[11] J. Monaco, How To Read A Film (rev. ed.), New York: Oxford, 1981, p. 293.

of several "socially significant youth films, paving the way for 'Easy Rider.'"[12]

> "The Wild Angels" was a classic exploitation bike movie . . .which formed a kind of underground folk literature for a certain segment of American youth. The [film] fabricated a myth to express what this group represented (order and the Establishment) and what they yearned for (excitement, perhaps death). The outlaw leader of the gang was always revealed as an existential hero (p. 182).

"The Wild Angels," and especially films such as "Easy Rider" and "The Wild One" by virtue of their notoriety and widespread popular appeal, typify the motorcycle "antisocial" film. Movies such as these portray motorcyclists as individualists with

> a dislike of institutions, a need for freedom from restraints, a preference for intuition and spontaneity as a source of conduct, a reluctance to settle down, a distrust of marriage, and a playfulness that suggested a resistance to growing up.[13]

The point to be made here is that motorcyclists are regularly depicted by the Hollywood establishment as out-group lawbreakers.

The importance of portrayals such as these is made clear when one looks at the literature on stereotyping.[14] In short, we

---

[12] J. Morella & E.Z. Epstein, Rebels: The Rebel Hero in Films, New York: Citadel, 1971, p. 180.

[13] Robert B. Ray, A Certain Tendency of the Hollywood Cinema, 1930-1980; Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985, p. 313.

[14] see W. Lippmann, "The World Outside and the Pictures in Our Heads," in W. Schramm & D. Roberts (Eds.) The Process and Effects of Mass Communication (2nd Ed.), Urbana; University of Illinois Press, 1971: W.J. Severin, Communication Theories: Origins, Methods, Uses (2nd Ed.), New York; Longman, 1988: L. Gibbons, Is

may safely conclude that the stereotyping function exists, it is a powerful force in the way media consumers shape their perceptions of reality, stereotypes are difficult to change once established, and individuals can learn stereotypes from the media. When a person is identified as being a motorcyclist, the inference is often made that that person also has other less desirable traits, whether that person embodies those traits or not. One such trait is that of membership in, and the allegiance to, the counter-culture.

The second indicator that motorcyclists represent counter-culture lies in the well documented phenomenon that motorcyclists generally do not trust government to protect their best interests. The editorial pages in the motorcycling press[15] provide ample evidence that motorcyclists have little faith in the establishment government. A consistent theme discussed in the motorcycle press could be stated "if the industry doesn't control itself, big government will," or "freedom restricted is not freedom worth having."[16] The motorcycle press often states explicitly that strong, centralized government is to be avoided at all costs. The editor of the AMA's official monthly magazine,

---

"The Price" Right?: Stereotypes, Co-production Policy and Irish Television, ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 293 513: G. P. Boss, "The Stereotype and its Correspondence in Discourse to the Enthymeme," Communication Quarterly, 27(2), 22-27.

[15]The phrase "motorcycling press" refers to special-interest periodicals that target motorcyclists, such as Motorcyclist, Cycle World, the now-defunct Cycle and Cycle Guide, and the AMA's official magazine, American Motorcyclist.

[16]For example, see Fred Gregory, Cycle World, "How Much Government is in Our Future?" June 1977, pp. 98-100.

American Motorcyclist,[17] warned readers about plans to "produce the most highly regulated and centrally planned international economy the world has yet seen. Talk about your big government!"[18] A columnist for another magazine warned "motorcycling, a sport of individuals, remains under institutional attack" from the federal government.[19] Another columnist declared "expect the big guns to be rolled out. Government will step in. Heavily. And you what that can mean: over-reaction, over-regulation and hastily-drafted laws that hurt responsible riders."[20] That sentiment is echoed by a reader, who wrote sarcastically "yes, what this country needs is complete government control over our lives."[21] Examples such as these are plentiful in the motorcycling press, and indicate a strong mistrust of strong centralized government typically held by motorcyclists.

Historical Perspective of the AMA

The AMA had two predecessors[22]. The first was the Federation of American Motorcyclists (FAM), founded in 1903 as a response to a New York City statute that required motorcyclists to register their vehicles with the city. The FAM is important

[17] The AMA communicates with its membership primarily through American Motorcyclist with a circulation of 166,500; Jim Bensberg, personal communication, Nov. 6, 1990.

[18] Ed Youngblood, American Motorcyclist, "The Dark Side of 1992," April 1990, p. 12.

[19] Steve Anderson, Cycle, "Social Costs," June 1989, p. 11.

[20] Stuart Munro, "The Unrider," American Motorcyclist, October 1990, p. 6.

[21] Terry Crock, "Post Entry," American Motorcyclist, August 1987, p. 6.

[22] Our discussion of the history of the American Motorcyclist Association is heavily indebted to "The First 60 Years: An Illustrated History of the American Motorcyclist Association," American Motorcyclist, January, 1984.

to this essay for two reasons. First its mission was to protect the rights of motorcyclists, and second, the FAM proposed to protect its membership by adopting a politically active agenda. The FAM Constitution claimed "one of the group's chief intentions [was] 'to ascertain, defend and protect the rights of motorcycling.'"[23] The FAM fell on hard times in the mid 1910's, with financial difficulties and declining membership.

The second predecessor of the AMA was organized to protect the motorcycling industry, clearly a different mission compared to the FAM. Recognizing the need to build and maintain a group that consumed their products, the Motorcycle and Allied Trades Association (M&ATA) was founded in 1916 with a membership composed of motorcycle manufacturers and other related industries. The M&ATA attempted to help bolster the floundering FAM, but eventually failed; the FAM folded in 1919. Thus by default, the M&ATA became the most influential motorcycling organization in America.

During the same period, motorcycle racing became a popular spectator sport, as well as the object of popular criticism.[24] Cross country, board track, and up-hill racing developed in the early part of the century, and all three were perceived by some as dangerous. As motorcycle racing grew in popularity, so grew the need for a sanctioning body to organize racing activities. In 1919 the M&ATA created its Competition Committee, designed to sanction racing. This action is meaningful in that it recognized

[23] American Motorcyclist, January, 1984, p. 48.

[24] See John E. Van Barriger, "Motordrome Madness," American Motorcyclist, January 1991, pp. 19-23; Louis Shafer, "Survival of the Fittest," American Motorcyclist, February 1990.

the need for an organization that served motorcyclists, not the motorcycle industry. It was this concern for the people who rode machines that eventually led to the establishment of the American Motorcyclist Association in 1924, formed as a result of major restructuring of the M&ATA. The AMA functioned as an independent organization for the first time around 1966[25].

The AMA "is the only national organization devoted to serving all of America's motorcyclists and equipped to work effectively for the betterment of motorcycling."[26] One reason the AMA claims to be important to motorcycling is that it is the largest association of motorcyclists in the U.S.; membership was recently estimated at 189,000.[27] Even so, the AMA is a comparatively small organization; for example, the National Rifle Association has a membership of around three million members.[28]

At present, the primary missions of the AMA can be described as falling into three categories; 1) to serve as a sanctioning body for competitive racing activities, 2) to provide a wide variety of services for motorcyclists in general and specifically for the membership, and 3) to represent the legislative interests of motorcyclists. It is the third mission that is the focus of this examination. We have already shown that the formation of the AMA and its predecessors were, in part, responses to

---

[25] Documenting the precise date of the separation of the M&ATA and the AMA is difficult; see American Motorcyclist, January, 1984, p. 57.

[26] American Motorcyclist Association Reader Survey, 1989, p. 15. It is available from the American Motorcyclist Association, P. O. Box 6114, Westerville, OH, 43081-6114.

[27] Jim Bensberg, personal communication, Nov. 6, 1990.

[28] Encyclopedia of associations (Detroit: Gale Research, Inc., 1991, 25th Ed., p. 2,236).

legislation that restricted the rights of motorcyclists.[29] At various times, legislation has either been proposed or passed that restricted motorcyclists from public parks, required the use of catalytic converters, restricting off-road access on public lands, and to restrict the speed and power of motorcycles. To address legislative concerns more directly, the AMA created the Legislative Department in 1970, now known as the Government Affairs Department.[30]

The AMA and the NHTSA clashed ideologically in the late 1960's and early '70's concerning the issue of helmet laws. The AMA officially adopted a "freedom of choice" stance in 1966 as a result of overwhelming membership opinion[31]. That stance states

> Although the Association strongly encourages helmet use by all motorcyclists, it maintains a long-standing fundamental belief that adults should continue to have the right to voluntarily decide when to wear a helmet.
>
> The Association further believes that helmet use alone is insufficient to ensure a motorcyclist's safety. There is a broad range of other measures that can be implemented to improve the skill of motorcycle operators as well as reduce

---

[29] See "The First 60 Years...," pages 48-54 for an overview of the AMA's government relations.

[30] The Government Relations Department employs Jim Bensberg as a Legislative Affairs Specialist. Bensberg spoke with one of the present authors twice by telephone; first on November 6, 1990 and again on May 17, 1991 regarding the AMA in general and specifically regarding the planning and execution of the PRO-RIDER Campaign.

[31] Bensberg, ibid.

the frequency of situations where other vehicle operators are the cause of accidents involving motorcycles.[32]

While it is still debated, most epidemiology studies indicate that motorcycle helmets prevent injuries and, as a consequence, save lives.[33] In an attempt to reduce motorcycle fatalities, the NHTSA threatened to withhold highway safety funds from any state that did not pass a helmet law. Thus the battle lines were drawn. State legislatures debated the merits of helmet laws for fear of losing millions of dollars in federal funding, and the AMA lobbied to keep any helmet law off the books. The conflict came to a temporary resolution when the AMA was able to persuade Congress to force the NHTSA to end its sanction threats. But the topic of helmet laws is still one that is frequently debated, mostly at the state legislature level.[34]

The PRO-RIDER Campaign

One project recently undertaken by the AMA and the NHTSA is the PRO-RIDER campaign.[35] To a large extent, the two organizations are unified in striving to reduce accidents and

---

[32] "Mandatory Helmet Laws: An Issue of Individual Choice," May 1989; available from the AMA, P. O. Box 6114, Westerville, Ohio, 43081-6114.

[33] The most frequently cited study was conducted by Hugh H. Hurt, Jr. in 1978, Status Report of Accident Investigation Data: Motorcycle Accident Cause Factors and Identification of Countermeasures (Springfield, VA: National Technical Information Service, Contract No. DOT HS-5-01160).

[34] The NHTSA has periodically called for mandatory helmet laws even after Congress' mandate; see "A Report to the Congress on The Effect of Motorcycle Helmet Use Law Repeal: A Case For Helmet Use," U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, April 1980.

[35] For a complete discussion about the PRO-RIDER Campaign, see R. Gobetz "The American Motorcyclist Association PRO-RIDER Campaign: A Case Study in Planned Social Change," paper delivered at the Sooner Communication Conference, April 5-6, 1991.

lower vehicular fatalities. Jim Bensberg coordinated AMA efforts with Ron Engle, the NHTSA PRO-RIDER project officer, only during the goals-creation stage; the execution of the campaign was the responsibility of the AMA, while NHTSA provided only the funding. It is this unique interaction between a special interest group (the out-group AMA) with a government agency (the in-group NHTSA) that is the focus of this study.

The PRO-RIDER Campaign "primarily addresses young riders and concentrates on three concerns -- motorcyclists who ride without a motorcycle endorsement on their license, alcohol and substance abuse by motorcycle riders, and encouraging helmet use."[36] The centerpiece of the program is the PRO-RIDER Code.[37] Members are asked to abide by the code voluntarily, and in exchange they receive specially designed helmet stickers that designate their membership in PRO-RIDER.

This essay asks "what are the rhetorical advantages gained from such a partnership, and who gains them?" From a strictly bureaucratic perspective, the NHTSA has little, if anything, to gain from such a collaboration since the mechanism to advance their own public safety campaigns is already in place. Why would the NHTSA engage in such a partnership with the AMA?

---

[36]U.S. Department of Transportation, Motorcycle rider deaths down by one-third, October 3, 1990. (Press release; available from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C., 20590

[37]Bensberg, personal correspondence; Motorcyclist, July 1990, p. 11; American Motorcyclist, April 1990, p. 60. See the Appendix for the complete PRO-RIDER Code of Ethics.

We attempt to answer these questions by examining the unusual ways in which in-group and out-group forces have been combined in the PRO-RIDER project. Clearly, the NHTSA represents the establishment voice for reducing motor vehicle fatalities. But motorcyclists, as a whole and as the AMA, have rejected previous attempts by the establishment to coerce states into passing helmet use laws. This behavior is typical of out-groups; in fact, it may be a defining characteristic of out-groups. In spreading its safety message, the NHTSA faced a rhetorical problem of face credibility with the target audience (motorcyclists) who refused to accept the legitimacy of the establishment voice. How could the NHTSA communicate important safety information to a target group who did not recognize NHTSA legitimacy? NHTSA's rhetorical solution was made possible in the choice of using the AMA's out-group voice to carry its safety messages. By joining forces with the AMA, the NHTSA attempted to gain credibility with the AMA membership.

At this point, it is interesting to ask exactly who is co-opting who? One perspective would suggest that NHTSA, in its attempt to co-opt the AMA, tacitly admitted defeat on this ideological point. Since the PRO-RIDER campaign specifically acknowledges the voluntary aspects of wearing helmets while encouraging their use, the AMA could claim that the NHTSA financed a campaign that not only perpetuated the AMA "voluntary" message, but acknowledged its own defeat. However, a different analysis leads us to different conclusions; if laws are simply manifestations of the prejudices of the community, then public

information campaigns that ask for voluntary compliance such as PRO-RIDER that succeed in changing behaviors would also be successful in changing attitudes. That would, in turn, create a climate conducive to the adoption of mandatory helmet laws, something the NHTSA has long supported.

Implications

It is important to recognize that the key difference between establishment movements (as opposed to out-group movements) is the intended target. Both Zarefsky's establishment movement and traditional out-group movements target the government to enact their agenda. Therefore the legitimation strategies followed would be similar. The NHTSA/AMA case we describe suggests a new category apart from this conceptualization of an establishment movement. In Zarefsky's essay the establishment was, in essence, targeting the establishment itself. Whether presumptive legitimacy exists in this context is not the issue. Establishment movements may also target out-groups, which creates a new dynamic. Thus, the discussion of how legitimacy gaining strategies are employed by establishment movements targeting out-groups opens a new area of research for rhetorical scholars.

It is clear that in our case study that the NHTSA has established the minimum rhetorical goal of message legitimation without any attempt to establish institutional legitimization. Perhaps the very nature of out-group vs. in-group interaction prohibits this attempt at credibility at this level. Ultimately the message convergence of "safety through helmet use" shared by

the AMA and the NHTSA will establish over the long term a degree of legitimation for the institution.

While it is undeniably useful, the use of an out-group vehicle to convey and establishment message may not always be an option to the establishment. Parallel strategies might be the development of a strategy to persuade prominent members of the opposition to join their side of the controversy. On this level, any converted member could serve as a symbolic voice for the establishment. If this is the case, establishment forces may have recently missed an opportunity to employ such a strategy. Entertainer Gary Busey crashed his motorcycle in 1989 while not wearing a helmet, suffering near-fatal head injuries.[38] Shortly thereafter Busey argued in public communication channels that helmets were not only ineffective against injury, but counterproductive and dangerous. Months later Busey reversed his position, announced his support for mandatory motorcycle training, and encouraged voluntary helmet use.[39] Had establishment forces been able to use Busey as a voice for their "mandatory" message, it would have received at least moderate credibility with an important target audience.

Future areas of research could include the differing contexts of out-group persuasion, the description of differing levels of institutional legitimation and finally, examination of co-optive rhetorical strategies employed by both establishment and out-group movements.

---

[38] Art Friedman, "The Gary Busey Story," Motorcyclist, March 1989, pp. 12, 116.

[39] "Busey Straps One On," American Motorcyclist, March 1990, p. 60; also see Cycle, March 1990, p. 23.

Appendix

The PRO-RIDER Code of Ethics

1. Always ride within your limits, obey all laws and observe all road warnings and traffic conditions.
2. Always wear the best protective apparel available. Make sure your helmet is fastened, fits properly and has a clean shield.
3. Invest in yourself. Take a beginner or experienced rider education course. Keep your skills sharp by practicing defensive riding so you'll be prepared if an emergency arises.
4. Motorcycling and drinking don't mix. Avoid alcohol and other intoxicants when riding.
5. Make sure you have the proper license to ride. Riding without a motorcycle endorsement is not only foolish, it's illegal.
6. Your bike is an extension of you. Keep it in top shape and respect others by keeping your exhaust system quiet.
7. Never loan your bike to anyone who does not have a motorcycle license and the necessary skills to ride.
8. Finally, enjoy the pleasures of riding. Be safety conscious and encourage others to follow this code.

[NOTE: The counter display also indicates that "this is a partial list. Always use common sense." In one telephone interview, the AMA's Jim Bensberg referred to the "common sense" plea as one of the points in the code.]